

# Enhancing the Evidence Base for Australian Theological Research

Paul Oslington. Professor of Economics and Dean of Business, Alphacrucis College, Parramatta.  
Honorary Professor, Australian Centre for Christianity and Culture/PACT Canberra.  
Email: [paul.oslington@ac.edu.au](mailto:paul.oslington@ac.edu.au)

Nick Jensen, Research Officer, Alphacrucis College.

Ingrid Ryan, Research Officer, Alphacrucis College.

## INTRODUCTION

Theology is one of the oldest disciplines in European universities, yet has a marginal and complicated place in Australia's higher education system<sup>1</sup>. This is partly to do with the history of our churches and partly the history of our higher education system<sup>2</sup>. Our first universities were founded at a time of intense controversy over the place of Roman Catholics and Dissenting churches in the English universities. University of Sydney, founded in the 1850s mostly by devout Anglicans and Presbyterians, specifically excluded the teaching of theology and confined the church's role to residential colleges on the edges of the campus<sup>3</sup>. It was a case of excluding clerics to facilitate both education and true religion<sup>4</sup>. The University of Melbourne took a similar approach, leading to the establishment of the Melbourne College of Divinity in 1910 as a degree awarding consortium of church colleges<sup>5</sup>. Similar reasons were behind the other major theological consortium, the Australian College of Theology, which was founded in 1891<sup>6</sup>. Almost all students of theology at these colleges were preparing for ordained ministry in their church denominations<sup>7</sup>.

Many universities later included religious studies in their Faculties of Arts, taking a purportedly neutral outsider approach to religions, in contrast to the committed insider approach of theology. Religious Studies has tended to attract anti-religious, often former religious believers, and has struggled to establish itself as a coherent discipline as distinct from the older disciplines it grew out of such as

---

<sup>1</sup> The role of theology within Australia's higher education system is discussed by Piggin 1997, Treloar 2017, Franzmann 2007, and Oslington 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Histories of our higher education system include Forsyth 2014 and Davis 2017. General histories of our churches include Carey 1996 and Breward 2001, with more detail on Roman Catholic church in O'Farrell 1992, and the evangelical churches in Piggin and Linder 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Kaye 2012

<sup>4</sup> It is a myth that Australia's constitution mandates the exclusion of religion from public life, or our higher education system. This is discussed by Frame 2006, and Stout 2008 who is not a religious believer argues that the slippage of the meaning of secular from neutrality between religions (including no religion) and exclusion of religion is damaging for society.

<sup>5</sup> Beirne 2010, Sherlock 2017

<sup>6</sup> Treloar 1997, 2018.

<sup>7</sup> An interesting exception is the College founded in Parramatta by Rev Samuel Marsden, which has a claim to be the oldest higher education institution in Australia, and certainly the oldest to enrol international students. See Austin 2013.

history, philosophy, classics, philology, and oriental studies<sup>8</sup>. As Australia's newer universities were founded they also kept theology at a distance,<sup>9</sup> at least until government funding was tied to student numbers and some enterprising university administrators saw the potential revenue streams from adopting theological colleges. Examples are the arrangements between CSU and St Marks National Theological Centre; between University of Newcastle and Morpeth; and arrangements Flinders University made in Adelaide and Murdoch University in Perth.

An exception to the exclusion of theology is Australian Catholic University - a public university founded in 1991 following Australian government pressure to consolidate teaching and nursing training, and which curiously lacked a Faculty Theology for many years<sup>10</sup>. Another exception is University of Notre Dame Australia which was founded as a private university in Western Australia in 1989<sup>11</sup>. Others may follow in the next few years such as my own institution Alphacrucis, associated with the Pentecostal movement and with campuses now in every Australian state, and Avondale, associated with the Seventh Day Adventists and located on the NSW Central Coast. One of the theological colleges, Melbourne College of Divinity became a University in 2010 through an act of Victorian Parliament just before the States handed over power to accredit universities to the Commonwealth and the national regulator TEQSA began operating. Its accreditation as the University of Divinity is in the somewhat strange category of University of Specialisation, which some other theological colleges are currently seeking.

Much less is known about theological research in Australia than is known about research in other disciplines. Australia's church-run theological colleges have produced a smattering of scholars of international renown, some of whom sadly have left to pursue opportunities in overseas universities<sup>12</sup>. In recent times, the adoption of some theological colleges into universities, the increasing demand for postgraduate research degrees in theology, and requirements from accreditation agencies, have raised the profile of research in the sector. Theological colleges not connected to universities receive no direct project or block government funding for research, nor the funding of academics research time that is built into university teaching funding, and so resourcing research continues to be difficult<sup>13</sup>.

A landmark study of the Australian theology sector *Uncovering Theology* led by Charles Sherlock and supported by the peak bodies and some government funding highlighted the increasing engagement of theology with the national research system and the strength of theological research<sup>14</sup>. The ARC ERA rankings provide evidence for religion and theology research in our universities, but most Australian

---

<sup>8</sup> Fitzgerald 2003

<sup>9</sup> The story of University of Western Sydney is told by Hutchinson 2013a, 2013b.

<sup>10</sup> Craven 2008, Hirst 2015

<sup>11</sup> Molloy and Tannock 2014

<sup>12</sup> Surveys include Banks 1976, Goosen 2000.

<sup>13</sup> Ormerod 2011, Oslington 2019

<sup>14</sup> Sherlock 2009. Further work on teaching and learning in Ball 2012. Both these publications were sponsored by the peak body CDT and received some government funding through the now defunct Australian Learning and Teaching Council, and Office of Learning and Teaching.

theological researchers operate outside the universities<sup>15</sup>. Individual colleges' websites provide some information on the publications of their researchers, and some such as Alphacrucis, have undertaken a mock ERA, but lack of consistency and many gaps make it difficult to formulate an accurate and up-to-date picture of Australian research publications in religion and theology. As well as the lack of data on publications, it is difficult to gauge the quality of these publications due to the absence of an authoritative ranking of journals that is comparable with rankings that exist for other disciplines<sup>16</sup>.

Another area of obscurity is competitive research grants in religion and theology. The most important source for Australian researchers is the ARC, and it makes available on its website the details of grants it has awarded. However, it is not just a matter of searching for grants awarded in the religion and theology subject codes, for many applicants avoid these codes and use history, sociology or other codes because of perceived difficulties of obtaining ARC funding for explicitly theological research.

This project addresses two major gaps in the evidence base: it provides an evidence-based expert-informed ranking of religion and theology journals, and an analysis of ARC grants in religion and theology. It is endorsed by the peak bodies the Council of Deans of Theology and ANZATS and funded by the Australian Research Theology Foundation with additional contributions from the peak bodies, the University of Divinity, Charles Sturt University, and Alphacrucis. It builds on a previous 2011 project financed by the Australian Research Theology Foundation and several universities on the place of theology in Australia's research funding system, and which included an analysis of ARC grants in religion and theology. We appreciate the engagement of senior ARC staff with the current and the previous project.

We will now summarise the methodology and findings of the two parts of the project, before drawing general conclusions about Australian theological research.

## JOURNAL RANKINGS

Rankings of universities and journals are an increasingly prominent part of contemporary academic culture. It is not just politicians, journalists and bureaucrats who are driving this but academics own concerns about esteem<sup>17</sup>.

**Criteria.** What are appropriate criteria for ranking religion and theology journals? Citations are the most important impact metric for journals in the sciences, and the most used citations statistic is the impact factor, which is the number of citations the journal has attracted divided by the number of citable items

---

<sup>15</sup> The most recent rankings are ARC 2019a, along with the new impact and engagement metrics ARC 2019b.

<sup>16</sup> An example of rankings in another discipline is the Australian Business Deans Council rankings available on their website. The best ranking across all disciplines remains the 2010 ARC ERA ranked journal list, which is no longer officially used by the ARC. [<Link to ERA rankings>](#)

<sup>17</sup> The debate over rankings is surveyed by Espeland and Sauder 2016. My own primary discipline of economics seems rankings obsessed – perhaps a symptom of its uncertain place in sciences and wider society.

the journal has published over a specified period. Another statistic is the H Index, which is the number of articles cited at least that number of times over a specified period. This gets around the problem of journal impact factors being distorted by a single very highly cited article. Besides citations, esteem measures are sometimes used, as in the case of surveying scholars working in the field and asking them to rank journals.

There are many problems with citation measures. The set of journals from which citations are collected is crucial. For instance, if a small number of theology journals are included in a set of mostly religious studies journals then the citation rates of the theology journals will be very low, suggesting that theology journals are of low quality. An alternative explanation that religious studies and theology are disparate fields seems more plausible because reversing the analysis and including a small number of religious studies journals in a set of theology journals leads to the religion journals being little cited.

The time period over which citations are collected also matters. In the sciences, articles tend to be cited for a shorter period, whereas in the humanities, it tends to take longer for the significance of contributions to emerge and classic articles and books are cited heavily for many years.

Disciplinary cultures also make a difference to citation measures. The sciences have a journal publication culture whereas books are most important in the humanities. Co-authorship is the norm in the sciences but rare in the humanities. There are large variations in the average number of citations in journals articles across different fields, with scientists generally citing a lot more articles than humanities scholars. Patterns of citation across disciplines are themselves an interesting subject. Basic science, for instance, is much more cited in the applied sciences than the reverse and classics is more cited by religion scholars than the reverse<sup>18</sup>.

In the humanities, geographic and other contextual factors have more impact upon citations than in the sciences. Physics is physics whether it is done in Australia or Europe, but history or sociology of religion is often geographically specific. A physics publication thus is potentially citable in all physics journals, whereas an article on trends in Australian church attendance is less likely to be cited in European religion journals, and European church attendance is similarly of less interest in the Australian context. Accordingly, some types of work where context is important, including a lot of religion and theology scholarship, are going to attract fewer citations because of their nature. Novel or non-mainstream research tends to be undervalued by citation counts, though may turn out to be the most significant in the long-term as it becomes the new mainstream.

---

<sup>18</sup> A group of scientists has recently begun mapping disciplines and their interactions using citation data. A field is a cluster of publications that cites itself, and the strength and direction of citation relationships between fields can then be investigated. Citation maps are discussed by Howard 2011, and a citation map for the social sciences produced by West, Bergstrom and Rosvall 2004 is reproduced as Figure 1. It would be really interesting to map the relationships between different religion and theology subfields, and the relationships to other fields such as history, philosophy, and literary studies.

There are a few technical issues to watch with citation measures. Different sources of citations (such as Google Scholar, Elsevier's Scopus, and the Clarivate Web of Science) vary greatly in their coverage of books and journals, and how far back in time they go<sup>19</sup>. Impact factors depend on the count of citable articles as well as citations and there are large variations between journals and sources to contend with. A journal that publishes a large proportion of book reviews that are counted as citable articles, yet tend to be less cited, will have its impact factor pulled down artificially. One thing that was striking about the citation data in religion and theology was how few citations journals outside the top journals in these fields attract, making impact factors subject to large standard errors.<sup>20</sup> This makes ranking on the basis of citations particularly problematic for religion and theology.

Citation measures also just consider usage by other academics, neglecting wider impact and engagement, for instance in the churches, schools, and NFPs.

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of journal rankings is their effect on behaviour of scholars and administrators. Complaints include a preoccupation with where scholars publish rather than what is published, pressure for scholars and editors to follow academic fashions, and the neglect of Australian journals and research on Australian topics. These problems are magnified the more rankings drive appointments, promotion, workload, redundancy, and funding decisions in universities.

Rankings are unlikely to lose their influence in the academic world anytime soon and the view taken in this project is similar to that of a recent commentator who wrote that, "the institutional and administrative realities within which we work demand comparative assessment and accountability. Bibliometric measures are here to stay, so let's make the best of them. It is better to try to understand – and to argue for more appropriate uses of – quantitative metrics than to turn our backs on them in ignorance."<sup>21</sup>

## **METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS FOR JOURNAL RANKINGS**

Our first task was to assemble a comprehensive list of journals in religion and theology, including journals that seek to bridge between religion and theology and other academic fields. Existing listings such as the Australian Research Council ERA list, international listings and suggestions from experts in various fields enabled us to identify just under one thousand journals. This is approximately double the number of religion journals included in the last journal ranking exercise that the Australian Research Council conducted in 2010.

---

<sup>19</sup> Harzing and Alakangas 2016 compare results from citation analyses from Google Scholar, Scopus and the Web of Science.

<sup>20</sup> Stern 2013 found standard errors to be large and hence the reliability low for impact factors journals outside the top journals in economics, a field with a much larger volume of citations than religion and theology.

<sup>21</sup> Engler 2014 p216

In view of some of the problems with citation data discussed above, we supplemented citation data with comparisons to other rankings of religion and theology journals that were available, and utilised the expertise of a panel of senior researchers in different areas of religion and theology. [<Link Our rankings may be found here>](#)

**Citation Data.** For citations we used the publicly available Elsevier Scopus SCImago data which has been available since 2004, and reported citations, impact factors and H indices for the journals. Coverage of religion and theology journals in Scopus is seriously incomplete and idiosyncratic. The majority of currently listed journals are religion journals, while the few theology journals that are listed, suffer as a result of this and are undervalued in the SCImago statistics. An advantage of SCImago is that it includes book citations as well as journal citations, though the set of books included may be as problematic as the set of journals.

Established in the 1960s, the Clarivate Web of Science data predates Scopus, and is the foundation of the current discipline of bibliometrics. It has had several owners, most recently the Thomson Reuters, and previously ISI. Clarivate has been chosen as the supplier of citation data to the Australian Research Council for ERA purposes. Its focus is journal citations and the coverage of religion and theology journals in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index and Emerging Sources Citation Index sections of the Web of Science is much wider than the coverage in SCImago. Impact factors are not calculated by Clarivate for arts and humanities journals because of concerns about the use of the Impact Factor indicator out of context. Clarivate citation data in this context is the most reliable source based on cover to cover indexing of journals and books selected under their journal selection criteria and the consistency of capturing citation connections. Citation metrics are only available to subscribers of their platform and so have not been made public in this report or our rankings spreadsheet.

We considered using citations from Google Scholar in conjunction with the Harzing Publish or Perish software that facilitates analysis<sup>22</sup>. For other fields, this software has been shown to provide data on a more complete set of books and journals, though it is unclear whether this applies to religion and theology. Unfortunately, the need to carry out an individual analysis for each of our almost one thousand journals made using this prohibitive within the timeframe and budget of this project, but analysis of the Google Scholar data using the Harzing software could be part of a future project.

Another possibility was generating Google N-grams<sup>23</sup> for each journal title, which would have given us the number of mentions of the journal title in books published in English over a time period nominated by us. A difficulty with this is that journal titles are often abbreviated or mentioned rather than properly cited in books, especially older books. Some journal titles such as “Religion” or “Theological Studies” are used in other ways than to cite an article in that journal. Using Google N-grams would, however,

---

<sup>22</sup> Harzing 2007 2016

<sup>23</sup> Michel et al 2011. An example of their use is the appendix to Oslington 2018

remedy the limitation of the Clarivate citation data which includes citations from only books indexed in the Book Citation Index Science and Social Science & Humanities. An illustrative example is given in Figure 2, but timeframe and budget constraints on this project made full analysis of journals with Google N-grams impossible.

**Existing Rankings.** Alongside citations data the research team utilised existing rankings of theology journals. The most important is the ranking undertaken by the Australian Research Council as part of ERA2010 [<link to ERA 2010 ranked journal list>](#), though withdrawn and no longer officially used or published on the Australian Research Council website. Their great advantage is that they cover all disciplines and allow us to benchmark religion and theology rankings against other disciplines. Rankings exercises undertaken by the Australian Catholic University, and the Catholic University of Leuven in Belgium, were also utilised as comparative studies.

**Expert Panel.** The expertise of senior scholars in religion and theology was drawn upon to review the draft ranking that Paul Oslington determined on the basis of the citations data and comparisons with other available rankings. We appreciate the contributions of our expert panel Professor Neil Ormerod (Theology - Sydney College of Divinity), Professor Mark Thompson (Theology - Moore College), A/Prof Denise Austin (History – Alphacrucis), Prof James Dalziel (Christian Education – Morling College), Dr Mark Harding (Biblical Studies – ANZATS/CDT), A/Prof Jacqui Grey (Biblical Studies – Alphacrucis), Dr John Flett (Missions – University of Divinity), Prof Darren Cronshaw (Pastoral Studies – Sydney College of Divinity) and Dr Fotini Toso (Research Development Coordinator – University of Divinity). The draft rankings were reviewed in the light of the comments and suggested alternative rankings from the reviewers, but responsibility for the rankings provided in the spreadsheet rests with the project team led by Paul Oslington.

**Scales.** After much discussion the research team decided to use a ranking scale A\*-A-B-C to parallel the ERA2010 scale, allowing benchmarking across disciplines and consistency with other bodies such as the Australian Business Deans Council who use this scale in their rankings. The alternative would have been ranking journals into bands consistent with the current Australian Research Council ERA numerical scaling system, whereby a score of 5 represents performance “well above world standard” at the highest level, and 1 corresponds to performance “well below world standard,” at the lowest. The most recent ranking of Australian Universities religion and theology is available here [<link to ERA 2018 rankings in Philosophy and Religious Studies>](#).

**Distribution.** Our distribution of rankings [<link to Journal Rankings 2019>](#) is broadly similar to the rankings of religion and theology journals in ERA2010, though we have a large tail of C ranked journals that reflects our greater comprehensiveness.

## **COMPETITIVE RESEARCH GRANTS**

The increasing focus in contemporary universities on winning competitive research grants raises many issues. The most obvious is that research grants are input to the research process and not an output. One could imagine an academic who produced many high-quality and heavily cited publications losing out in a university appointment or promotion committee to an academic with a poorer publication record but who has won several large Australian Research Council Grants. Yet, from a government point of view, the academic who missed out has a much higher research productivity in the sense of output generated per dollar of taxpayer funding. This creates perverse incentives for academics, especially for those with strong publication records who are capable of winning competitive research grants, to find ways of doing their research that uses large amounts of grant funding. It is a particular problem for humanities academics when administrators compare their research grant income with scientists, and pressure them to spend more of their time applying for research grants, rather than undertaking actual research.

Why then do Australian universities place so much emphasis on grant income? A cynic might suggest that this is because many senior university administrators now care more about money flowing in to fund lavish salaries and bureaucratic entourages than they do about scholarship. Another explanation might be that it is a by-product of the obsession with measurement and ranking. Research quality is difficult to measure and the rigorous assessment processes of grant bodies like the Australian Research Council make grants won a readily available proxy for the quality of research done by an individual scholar or university.

Just as journal rankings will remain part of contemporary academic culture for the foreseeable future, so will judgements about the value of research, measured by Australian Research Council success. For this reason, as well as the potential usefulness to religion and theology researchers of grant funding, attention to the place of religion and theology at the Australian Research Council and similar bodies, is warranted.

## **ANALYSIS OF ARC GRANTS IN RELIGION AND THEOLOGY**

The project, like the previous 2011 analysis of grants in religion and theology, utilises the data the Australian Research Council provides on grants that it has awarded since it began operations in 2002. Grants are awarded differently through different schemes, including “Discovery”, which funds basic research, and “Linkage,” which funds more applied projects in partnership with industry. There are also the highly competitive Discovery Early Career Fellowships, Future Fellowships, and Laureate Fellowships. Grants are classified according to field of research codes, including religion and theology 2204 (previously 4402).



**Identifying Grants.** As mentioned above, identifying grants in religion and theology is not just a matter of searching for grants awarded in the religion and theology codes. Our listing obviously includes these but the research team also searched for the names of major Australian religion and theology researchers, and searched various religion and theology keywords. Searching outside the religion codes is important because there has been a clear trend away from applying in the religion codes, and more and more religion and theology projects are being awarded funding in other codes. Searching for grants without religion codes is somewhat of an arbitrary process but the outcome is a listing [<link to ARC Grants in Theology 2002-2018>](#) that we believe yields a more rounded picture of Australian Research Council support of religion and theology research.

**Analysis.** Besides listing the grants and amounts awarded in religion and theology from 2002-2018 (see tables 1 and 2 of the linked attachment), and total grants awarded (see table 3 of the attachment), we have also reported numbers of applications and calculated success rates for applications where religion is the primary code (table 4 of the attachment).

Funding by the ARC of religion research, and especially theology research, is very thin indeed. Grants with religion as the primary code are  $52/23944 = 0.2\%$  of grants and  $7/5193 < 0.01\%$  of fellowships awarded. If we extend this to include religion or theology projects regardless of codes then it becomes  $135/23944 = 0.5\%$  of project grants and  $18/5193 = 0.3\%$  of fellowships. Very few of these are theology projects.

Grants in religion tend to be small, and so the proportion of religion funding is even smaller than the proportion of grants awarded. Funding of projects with religion as the primary code was \$13,492,912 which is 0.16% of total ARC funding. Including all religion and theology projects, funding was \$50,003,628 which is 0.65% of the total.

To get an idea of how thin the funding of religion and theology research actually is, we compared the proportion of religion and theology grants with proportion of academics in this field. There are various ways of calculating the number of religion and theology academics. We consider the most reliable estimate to be that of Charles Sherlock's *Uncovering Theology*<sup>24</sup> study's determination of 712 full time equivalent academics, which makes them about 0.9% of all academics. Of these about 209 or about 0.3% of all academics work in universities and are eligible to apply to the ARC through their institutions. Another method is to consider the primary research code nominated by university researchers as part of the ARC ERA process, which gives 181 academics, which is reasonably close to the figure calculated from the Sherlock data. Note that detailed calculations of all these figures are given in the attachment. What we see is that the proportions of grants and fellowships with a primary code religion are less than the proportion of religion and theology academics eligible to apply to the ARC, and very much less than the proportion of all religion and theology academics. The biggest factor in the

---

<sup>24</sup> Sherlock 2009 p42.

thinness of support for theology research in Australia is the ineligibility of most theology researchers to apply for ARC funding.

We can also compare the proportion of grants in religion and theology to the proportion of religion and theology publications. From the calculations in the attachment based on ARC ERA 2015 data, publications reported with religion codes are  $216/5488 = 3.9\%$  of books,  $905/45,269 = 2.0\%$  of book chapters,  $954/301,499 = 0.3\%$  of refereed journal papers. Proportions of religion books and book chapters are well above proportions of grants awarded, though journal articles are more in line with grants awarded.

Publications data for theology academics outside universities and thus ineligible for ARC grants are not available as their institutions are not included in ERA. I have access to data for my own institution Alphacrucis and publication rates in our theology faculty are substantially above those reported above for religion and theology academics in universities. The same may be true of other theology faculties outside universities, but probably not true on average for theologians outside universities because they tend to be teaching focused and their institutions receive no government research funding.

Even so, including religion and theology publications produced outside the universities would put the proportion of religion and theology publications even further above the proportion of grants.

Some of the trends in funding of religion and theology research are interesting.

A striking feature of table 1 of the attachment is the low and declining number of linkage grants awarded in religion and theology. This is strange when theology is a sector more engaged than most, certainly most in the humanities, with its community or industry. Some potential linkage partners would have difficulty coming up with cash contributions to projects, but many others are large and wealthy. Part of the reason may be the reluctance of potential religion and theology linkage partners to deal with universities who are eligible to apply to the ARC. This means that allowing institutions involved in theological research outside the university system to host ARC Linkage grants would improve industry collaboration

From table 4 of the attachment the number of applications with religion as primary code have averaged around 20 since the ARC began operations in 2002, but has fallen to 13, 13, and 11 in the last three years. This is at the same time when applications overall have been growing. Grants awarded with religion as the primary code in the last three years have been 2, 1, and 1, giving success rates of 15%, 8%, and 9%, all below the average success rate in religion of 17% for the period since 2002. It could be random variation. It could be evidence that applicants are increasingly avoiding religion codes, or that potential applicants' universities are not supporting ARC applications in religion codes, perhaps because of a widespread view that ARC processes are less and less hospitable to theological research or research on mainstream Christianity. There seems to have been a substantive fall in activity and probability of success in religion and theology in recent years, at the same time as increasing public interest in religion.

**Issues for Religion and Theology Researchers.** Some of the issues for religion and theology researchers dealing with the Australian Research Council were discussed in the paper which emerged out of the previous project <[link to Oslington 2012 \*The Place of Religion and Theology in the National Research System\*](#)>. Both theological researchers and the Australian Research Council have sought to address these issues, and the research team particularly appreciate their engagement at a workshop organised at Canberra in 2012 involving leaders in the theological sector and senior Australian Research Council staff.

In terms of the recommendations from the earlier paper (in italics), there has been some progress:

- *The Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education could consider how the National Research Priorities might better reflect neglected religious issues.*  
Religious issues remain neglected in the National Research Priorities, except perhaps indirectly through national security concerns.
- *The Australian Research Council could actively recruit Humanities and Creative Arts panel members with expertise in theology, along with the other skills and experience necessary.*  
Expertise in religion and theology on the panel remains an issue, though the ARC has sought to expand the assessor pool in theology. There remains scope for expanding the assessor pool, especially including theology researchers based in universities overseas. This is particularly important for specialised areas of theology. There is also a need for more expertise in the specialised area of religion and theology on the ARC Council of Experts and assessment panels.
- *The Australian Bureau of Statistics and Australian Research Council could consider the appropriateness of the codes for religion and theology research.*  
There has been some debate about separating the religion and theology codes, and revising the categories within them, but no consensus has emerged. Codes are currently under review.
- *Targeted training in Australian Research Council processes for research offices of colleges and universities, and for theological researchers*  
Little progress. This will have benefits regardless of whether or not theological colleges outside the university system become eligible institutions for ARC grant purposes. There is scope for researchers at these colleges applying through eligible universities.
- *Capacity building grants from the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education to enable theological institutions to develop their research offices, links with research universities, and networks of domestic and international researchers in religion and theology, able to facilitate partnerships and grant applications.*  
Little progress.
- *The Australian Research Council could consider an initiative specifically designed to connect religion and theology researchers up with those in other disciplines working on issues of*

*national importance. A model for this is the highly successful Religion and Society Program run by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council.*

Little progress specifically on this, though there was a brief rise in success rates for religion and theology applications at the ARC following the previous workshop.

- *Consideration could be given to the establishment of an Australian Academy of Religion and Theology alongside the other learned academies.*

This has not occurred, but the Australian Academy of Humanities has now established a Religion section independent of the Philosophy and History of Ideas section. This welcome initiative by the Academy of Humanities has strengthened the capacity for input from religion and theology scholars into national research policy, alongside the existing peak bodies - the Council of Deans of Theology and ANZATS - which have been more concerned with teaching and institutional issues up to this point.

There are currently 33 Fellows in the religion section of the Academy of Humanities, most of whom were elected before the formation of a separate religion section [<link to AAH Religion Section>](#). There are many historians of religion and religious studies scholars. It includes the biblical scholars John Painter, William Loader, Brendan Byrne, Dorothy Lee, and David Sim. There are no systematic theologians nor any quantitative sociologists of religion, despite Australia leading the world in this area through the work of the National Church Life Survey. Scholars of contemporary mainstream Christianity generally seem under-represented.

## CONCLUSIONS

This project has contributed to the evidence base for theological research in Australia through providing an evidence-based and expert-informed ranking of religion and theology journals. Structures are being put in place for the Council of Deans of Theology and ANZATS to maintain and regularly update the rankings. As discussed, there remains scope for enhancing these rankings including analysis of Google scholar citation data and utilising Google N-grams, as well as undertaking citation mapping to better understand the relationships between research in religion and theology and other disciplines. Such enhancements will of course require time commitment from sector leaders and funding.

The project has also updated the database prepared in 2012 of Australian Research Council grants in religion and theology, and compared grant success rates to publications and numbers of researchers, benchmarked against other disciplines. There has been limited progress in addressing some of the issues with the research grant and assessment system highlighted by the earlier project, and it is hoped that the updated data and discussion will stimulate action. Progress will depend on the degree of commitment and cooperation from all stakeholders: theological researchers, sector leaders, the Australian Research

Council, government departments and ministers responsible for research, and the Australian Academy of Humanities.

## REFERENCES

- Australian Research Council (2019a). *State of Australian University Research 2018-19: ERA National Report*. Canberra, Australian Research Council. <https://www.arc.gov.au/excellence-research-australia/era-reports>.
- Australian Research Council (2019b). *Engagement and Impact Assessment 2018-19 National Report*. Canberra, Australian Research Council. <https://www.arc.gov.au/engagement-and-impact-assessment>.
- Austin, Denise (2013). *Our College: A History of the National Training College of Australian Christian Churches* Sydney, Australasian Pentecostal Studies Press.
- Austin, Denise (2015). "The Parramatta Legacy." *Crucis* (<http://crucis.ac.edu.au/2015/02/the-parramatta-legacy/>).
- Ball, Les (2012). *Transforming Theology* Melbourne, Mosaic Press.
- Banks, Robert J. (1976). "Fifty Years of Theology in Australia, 1915-1965." *Colloquium* 9 (Part I p36-42; Part II p7-16.).
- Beirne, Paul (2010) "Melbourne College of Divinity: A Selective Historical Overview" *Pacifica* 23(2): 123-36.
- Bouma, Gary D. (2007). *Australian Soul: Religion and Spirituality in the Twenty-First Century* Melbourne, Cambridge University Press.
- Breward, Ian (2001). *A History of the Churches in Australasia* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Carey, Hilary (1996). *Believing in Australia* Sydney Allen & Unwin.
- Craven, Greg (2008) *The Idea of an Australian Catholic University*. Lecture at St Mary's Cathedral, Sydney.
- Davis, Glyn (2017). *The Australian Idea of a University* Melbourne, MUP.
- Engler, Steven (2014). "Bibliometrics and the Study of Religions." *Religion* 44(2): 193-219.
- Espeland, W. N. and M. Sauder (2016). *Engines of Anxiety: Academic Rankings, Reputation, and Accountability*, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Fitzgerald, Timothy (2003). *The Ideology of Religious Studies* Oxford, OUP.
- Frame, Tom R. (2006). *Church and State: Australia's Imaginary Wall* Sydney, UNSW Press.
- Forsyth, Hannah (2014). *A History of the Modern Australian University* Sydney, NewSouth Publishing.
- Franzmann, Majella (2008). "Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands" in *Religious Studies: A Global View* edited by G. D. Alles. New York, Routledge: 219-41.
- Gascoigne, John (2002). *The Enlightenment and the Origins of European Australia* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Goosen, Gideon (2000). *Australian Theologies: Themes and Methodologies into the Third Millennium* Strathfield, N.S.W., St. Pauls Publications.
- Harding, Mark (2018). "The Current Environment of Theological Education in Australia' in *Theological Education: Foundations, Practices, and Future Directions* edited by A. M. Bain and I. Hussey, Wipf & Stock: 274-86.
- Harzing, Anne-Wil (2007). "Publish or Perish." Software available at <http://www.harzing.com/pop.htm>.
- Harzing, Anne-Wil (2016). *The Publish or Perish Book: Your Guide to Effective and Responsible Citation Analysis* Melbourne, Tarma Software Research

- Harzing, Anne-Wil and S. Alakangas (2016). "Google Scholar, Scopus and the Web of Science: A Longitudinal and Cross-Disciplinary Comparison." *Scientometrics* 106(2): 787-804.
- Hirst, John B. (2015). *Australian Catholic University: The First Twenty-Five Years*. North Sydney: Australian Catholic University
- Howard, Jennifer (2011). "Citation by Citation, New Maps Chart Hot Research and Scholarship's Hidden Terrain." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 11).
- Hughes, Philip and Peter Bentley (2005). *A Brief Review of Church-Related Research in Australia 1975-2005* Melbourne, Christian Research Association - Occasional Research Paper No.6.
- Hudson, Wayne (2016). *Australian Religious Thought* Melbourne, Monash University Press.
- Hutchinson, Mark (2013a). *A University of the People: A History of the University of Western Sydney* Sydney, Allen and Unwin.
- Hutchinson, Mark (2013b). "Presence in the West: Religious Contributions to the Secular Ideology of an Australian University." *Journal of Religious History* 37(3): 391-409.
- Hutchinson, Mark (2014). "Fools and Fundamentalists: The Institutional Dilemmas of Australian Pentecostalism" in *The Many Faces of Global Pentecostalism* edited by H. D. Hunter and N. Ormerod. Cleveland, TN, CPT Press.
- Kaye, Bruce N. (2012). "Anglicans and the Founding of the University of Sydney." *Connor Court Quarterly. Special Issue: The Christian View of History and the Revival of the Liberal Arts* Collected Papers from a Colloquium held at Campion College, Sydney, August 2012.
- Michel, J. B. et als (2011). "Quantitative Analysis of Culture Using Millions of Digitized Books" *Science* 331(6014): 176-82.
- Molloy, Edward and Peter Tannock (2014). *The Founding and Establishment of the University of Notre Dame Australia*. <https://www.notredame.edu.au/about/notre-dame>.
- NCLS (2001-). *National Church Life Survey*. Sydney, NCLS Research.
- O' Farrell, Patrick (1992). *The Catholic Church and Community: An Australian History*. 3rd edition Sydney, UNSW Press.
- Ormerod, Neil. (2011). "Future Bites for Theological Colleges." *Eureka Street* 6 September.
- Oslington, Paul (2012). "The Place of Religion and Theology in the National Research System." Paper presented at the Council for Humanities and Social Sciences (CHASS) Inaugural Forum in Canberra, and the Australasian Association for the Study of Religion (AASR) annual conference in Sydney.
- Oslington, Paul (2014). "Religion and Australian Universities: Tales of Horror and Hope." *The Conversation* February. <https://theconversation.com/australian-universities-and-religion-tales-of-horror-and-hope-23245>
- Oslington, Paul (2018). *Political Economy as Natural Theology: Smith Malthus and Their Followers* London, Routledge.
- Oslington, Paul (2019). "Competition Policy in Higher Education" in *The Australian University in Crisis* edited by William Coleman. Melbourne, Connor Court.
- Hudson, Wayne. (2016). *Australian Religious Thought* Melbourne, Monash University Press
- Piggin, Stuart (1997). "A History of Theological Education in Australia" in *The Furtherance of Religious Beliefs: Essays on the History of Theological Education in Australia* edited by G. R. Treloar. Sydney, Centre for the Study of Australian Christianity.
- Piggin, Stuart and Robert D. Linder (2018). *The Fountain of Public Prosperity: Evangelical Christians in Australian History 1740–1914*, Monash University Publishing.
- Powell, Ruth, Miriam Pepper and Sam Sterland (2015). *The Impact of Congregations on Australian Society*: Sydney, NCLS Research.



- Sherlock, Charles (2009). *Uncovering Theology: The Depth, Reach and Utility of Australian Theological Education* Melbourne, ATF Press.
- Sherlock, Peter (2017). "Why Australia Needs Theology." Lecture at Trinity College, University of Melbourne. Available at <https://www.trinity.unimelb.edu.au/getmedia/6ce2f214-cbbe-40da-8a75-cda1cbea55c8/Why-Australia-Needs-Theology.aspx>
- Stern, D. I. (2013). "Uncertainty Measures for Economics Journal Impact Factors." *Journal of Economic Literature* 51(1): 173-89.
- Stout, Jeffrey (2008). "2007 Presidential Address: The Folly of Secularism" *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 76 (September): 533-44.
- Treloar, Geoffrey R. Ed, (1997). *The "Furtherance of Religious Beliefs": Essays on the History of Theological Education in Australia* Sydney, Centre for the Study of Australian Christianity for the Evangelical History Association of Australia.
- Treloar, Geoffrey R. (2009). "Towards a Master Narrative: Theological Learning and Teaching in Australia since 1901." *St Marks Review* 210 (November): 31-54.
- Treloar, Geoffrey R. (2017). "From the Martin Report to TEQSA: Church and State in Australian Theological Education, 1965-2015." Unpublished Conference Paper.
- Treloar, Geoffrey R. (2018). "The Three (or Four) Identities of the Australian College of Theology, 1891-2016" in *Theological Education: Foundations, Practices, and Future Directions* edited by A. M. Bain and I. Hussey. USA, Wipf and Stock.
- West, Jevon, Carl. T. Bergstrom and Martin Rosvall (2004). *Maps of Science: The Social Sciences*, Available at <http://www.eigenfactor.org/map/maps.php>.

## LINKS:

Journal Rankings 2019. [Excel or Pdf](#).

ARC Grants in Theology 2002-2018. [Pdf](#).


Oslington 2012 *The Place of Religion and Theology in the National Research System*. [Pdf](#).

ERA 2018 rankings in Philosophy and Religious Studies. [Excel](#).

ERA 2010 ranked journal list. No longer available on the Australian Research Council website but at <http://lamp.infosys.deakin.edu.au/era/?page=jmain>

AAH Religion Section. [Pdf](#)

**FIGURE 1 - MAP of SOCIAL SCIENCE 2004**



**FIGURE 2 - GOOGLE N-GRAM of SELECTED JOURNALS**

